

to compromise at 207.50. This isn't a compromise at all splitting the difference between my amendment of 200 and the bill's figure as introduced of \$215. I think that my amendment suggesting an increase of \$20 goes more than half way towards compromising Senator Wiitala's position at \$35, certainly more than 50 percent and again I repeat a fair and equitable compromise. Senator Hoagland makes reference to the workmen's compensation program in Iowa. I am not at all sure that we should follow the lead of Iowa insofar as workmen's compensation is concerned. I know that with reference to unemployment benefits the State of Iowa's unemployment benefit fund has now gone broke, along with 27 other states. It seems absolutely irresponsible. My amendment does go more than half way. I see no reason to get into an auction on this floor. I would urge you to defeat the Hoagland amendment to my amendment with the admonition, of course, that it will take only a simple majority to pass Senator Hoagland's amendment to my amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Senator Barrett. Senator Hoagland to close on your amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. President and colleagues, to lend some perspective as to what these figures actually mean, let me multiply them out for you. Now if we have a worker who was totally disabled for the rest of his life on the job, and this could be a worker that makes fifteen, twenty, twenty-five thousand dollars, a carpenter, a skilled craftsman of some sort or other, under Senator Barrett's amendment all he is going to get is \$10,000 a year for the rest of his life. Now one essential feature of the workmen's compensation law to keep in mind is that if in 1983 Steve Wiitala becomes totally disabled having made \$25,000 a year as an electrician, and he is awarded that \$10,000 a year for the rest of his life, say he gets electrocuted or something and suffers some mental damage, that \$10,000 figure will never increase and it can never increase as a matter of contract because Senator Wiitala is receiving his \$10,000 a year from the insurance company that has written a policy with Senator Wiitala's employer and that is a contract paying him those benefits which this Legislature has no power to affect ever in the future. So Senator Wiitala has a life expectancy with his brain damage of 40 years, let's say, he will never get any more than \$10,000 a year for the rest of his life because of contract law and constitutional law and so forth. Now is that fair? Is that